UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,320	10/16/2001	Kenneth H. Abbott	294438006US11	4975

25096	7590	11/15/2006		EXAMINER

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

PILLAI, NAMITHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 August 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-70* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

filed under 37 CFR §1.53(d) on 8/29/06.   Applicants have properly set forth the RCE,

which has been entered into the application, and an examination on the merits follows

herewith. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 24, 51 and

68. All pending claims have been rejected as being disclosed in or obvious over prior

arts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2.   Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims disclose a computer readable

medium which includes signals that do not represent a computer readable medium that

is a physical structure which allows the functionality to be realized with a computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 20-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by

U. S. Patent No. 5,910,799 (Carpenter et al.), herein referred to as Carpenter.

Referring to claim 28, Carpenter discloses presenting the selected predefined

user interface to the user (column 3, lines 61-67).

Referring to claim 29, Carpenter discloses that the dynamic determining and the

selecting are performed repeatedly so that the user interface that is presented to the

user is optimal and appropriate to the current needs (column 6, lines 39-46).

Referring to claims 30, 47, 50, 53, 56, 60, 64, 67 and 70, Carpenter discloses

that the determining and the selecting are performed without user intervention (column

3, lines 51-55).

Referring to claim 20, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically determining

an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device based on

a current context (column 2, lines 20-25). Carpenter also discloses for each multiple

predefined user interfaces, characterizing multiple properties of the predefined user

interface (column 2, lines 50-55). Carpenter also discloses dynamically determining

one or more current needs for a user interface to be presented to the user (column 2,

lines 55-60). Carpenter discloses selecting for presentation to the user one of the

predefined user interfaces who's characterized properties correspond to the dynamically

determined current needs (column 2, lines 49-59). Carpenter discloses presenting the

selected user interface to the user (column 3, lines 61-67).

Referring to claim 21, Carpenter discloses that the computer-readable medium is

a memory of a computing device (column 3, lines 44-49).

Referring to claim 22, Carpenter discloses that the computer-readable medium is a data transmission medium transmitting a generated data signal containing the contents (Figure 1).

Referring to claim 23, Carpenter discloses that the contents are instructions that when executed cause the computing device to perform the method (column 3, lines 44-47).

Referring to claims 24 and 26, Carpenter discloses a computing device for dynamically determining an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device (column 2, lines 20-23). Carpenter discloses a first component capable of, for each of multiple defined user interfaces, characterizing properties of the defined user interface (column 2, lines 49-59). Carpenter also discloses a second component capable of determining during execution one or more current needs for a user interface to be presented to the user (column 3, lines 60-67). Carpenter also discloses a third component capable of selecting during execution one of the defined user interfaces whose characterized properties correspond to the dynamically determined current needs, the selected user interface for presentation to the user (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 25, Carpenter discloses that the first, second and third components are executing in memory of the computing device (column 3, lines 44-47).

Referring to claim 27, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically determining an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device based on a current context (column 2, lines 20-23). Carpenter also discloses determining multiple

user interface elements that are available for presentation on the computing device
(column 2, lines 49-55). Carpenter also discloses characterizing properties of the
determined user interface elements and dynamically determining one or more current
needs for a user interface to be presented to the user (column 2, lines 49-59).
Carpenter also discloses generating a user interface for presentation to the user, the
generated user interface having user interface elements whose characterized properties
correspond to the dynamically determined current needs (column 3, lines 61-67).

Referring to claim 31, Carpenter discloses retrieving one or more definitions for
combining available user interface elements in an appropriate manner so as to satisfy
current needs, and wherein the generating of the user interface uses at least one of the
retrieved definitions to combine the user interface elements of the generated user
interface in a manner that is appropriate to the determined current needs (column 9,
lines 6-22).

Referring to claim 32, Carpenter discloses retrieving one or more definitions for
adapting available user interface elements to a type of computing device, and wherein
the generating of the user interface uses at least one of the retrieved definitions to
combine the user interface elements of the generated user interface in a manner
specific to the type of the computing device (column 9, lines 10-13).

Referring to claim 33, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically presenting
an appropriate user interface to a user of a computing device based on a current
context (column 2, lines 20-23). Carpenter discloses presenting a first user interface to
the user and without user intervention, determining that the current context has changed

in such a manner that the first user interface is not appropriate for the user (column 8,

lines 59-65). Carpenter discloses that the changed context includes multiple of a

change in current location of the user, a change in the current mental state of the user,

determined by user input of inquiries made by the user interface and a change in the

devices currently available to the user, wherein the interface presented is based on

taking into consideration the devices available to the user (column 4, lines 1-15 and

column 6, lines 10-30). Carpenter discloses selecting a second user interface that is

appropriate for the user based at least in part on the current context, and presenting the

second user interface to the user (column 8, lines 63-67).

Referring to claim 34, Carpenter discloses determining that the current context

has changed in such a manner that the first user interface is not appropriate for the user

includes automatically detecting the changes (column 8, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 35, Carpenter discloses selecting of the second user interface

is performed without user intervention (column 8, lines 63-68).

Referring to claim 36, Carpenter discloses that the second user interface is one

of multiple predefined user interfaces (column 9, lines 5-10).

Referring to claim 37, Carpenter discloses that the second user interface is

dynamically generated after the determining of the changes in the current context

(column 8, lines 59-67).

Referring to claim 38, Carpenter discloses that the second interface is a

modification of the first user interface (column 9, lines 5-10).

Referring to claim 39, Carpenter discloses modifying of the first user interface ("UI") includes modifying prominence of one or more UI elements of the first user interface, modifying associations between the UI elements, modifying a metaphor associated with the first user interface, modifying a sensory analogy associated with the first user interface, modifying a degree of background awareness associated with the first user interface, modifying a degree of invitation associated with the first user interface, and/or modifying a degree of safety of the user based on one or more indications presented as part of the second user interface that were not part of the first user interface (column 9, lines 5-20).

Referring to claim 40, Carpenter discloses a method for characterizing predefined user interfaces to allow a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to a user of a computing device to be dynamically selected (column 4, lines 50-60). Carpenter discloses for each of multiple predefined user interfaces, characterizing the user interface by, determining an intended use of the predefined user interface, determining one or more user tasks with which the predefined user interface is compatible, and determining one or more computing device configurations with which the predefined user interface is compatible, so that one of the predefined user interfaces can be dynamically selected for presentation to a user based on the selected user interface being currently appropriate (column 9, lines 1-22).

Referring to claim 41, Carpenter discloses determining information about a current context and selecting one of the predefined user interfaces that is appropriate for the current context (column 9, lines 1-20).

Referring to claim 42, Carpenter discloses characterizing of each of the

predefined user interfaces includes at least one of characterizing content of the

user interface, characterizing a cost of using the user interface, characterizing a

relevant date for the user interface, characterizing a design of elements of the

user interface, characterizing functions of the elements of the user interface,

characterizing hardware affinity of the user interface, characterizing an

identification of the user interface, characterizing an importance of the user

interface, characterizing input and output devices that are compatible with the

user interface, characterizing languages to which the user interface corresponds,

characterizing a learning profile of the user interface, characterizing task lengths

for which the user interface is compatible, characterizing a name of the user interface,

characterizing physical availability of the user interface, characterizing a

power supply of the user interface, characterizing a priority of the user interface,

characterizing privacy supported by the user interface, characterizing processing

capabilities used for the user interface, characterizing safety capabilities of the

user interface, characterizing security capabilities of the user interface,

characterizing a source of the user interface, characterizing storage capabilities

used for the user interface, characterizing audio capabilities of the user interface,

characterizing task complexities compatible with the user interface, characterizing

themes corresponding to the user interface, characterizing an urgency level for

the user interface, characterizing a user attention level for the user interface,

characterizing user characteristics compatible with the user interface,

characterizing user expertise levels compatible with the user interface,

characterizing user preference accommodation capabilities of the user interface,

characterizing a version of the user interface, and characterizing video

capabilities of the user interface (column 8, lines 45-67 and column 9, lines 1-20).

Referring to claim 43, Carpenter discloses characterizing of each of the

predefined user interfaces is performed without user intervention (column 8, lines 60-

67).

Referring to claims 44, 48 and 54, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically

determining requirements for a user interface that is currently appropriate to be

presented to a user of a computing device based on a current context (column 3, lines

60-67). Carpenter also discloses dynamically determining one or more current

characteristics of a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to the

user, the determining based at least in part on the current context and identifying at

least some of the determined characteristics as requirements for a user interface that is

currently appropriate to be presented to the user (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claims 45, 49, 52 and 55, Carpenter discloses determining a user

interface that satisfies the determined requirements and presenting the determined user

interface to the user (column 3, lines 64-67).

Referring to claim 46, Carpenter discloses that the determining of the current

characteristics includes determining characteristics corresponding to a current

task being performed, determining characteristics corresponding to a current

situation of the user, and/or determining characteristics corresponding to current

I/O devices that are available (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 51, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically determining requirements for a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to a user of a computing device (column 3, lines 60-67). Carpenter discloses dynamically determining one or more current characteristics of a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to the user, the determining based at least in part on a current I/O devices that are available to

the computing device and identifying at least some of the determined characteristics as requirements for a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to the user (column 9, lines 5-20).

Referring to claim 57, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically determining characteristics of a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to a user of a computing device (column 3, lines 60-67). Carpenter also discloses dynamically determining a level of attention which the user can currently give to the user interface and dynamically determining one or more current characteristics of a user interface that is currently appropriate to be presented to the user based at least in part on the determined level of attention (column 8, lines 60-67 and column 9, lines 1-20).

Referring to claim 58, Carpenter discloses determining a user interface that includes the determined characteristics and presenting the determined user interface to the user (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 59, Carpenter discloses that the determined level of attention is based on a determined current cognitive load of the user (column 8, lines 60-67 and column 9, lines 1-20).

Referring to claim 61, Carpenter discloses determining of the level of attention is performed without user intervention (column 9, lines 5-10).

Referring to claim 62, Carpenter discloses a method for determining techniques for dynamically generating an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device (column 2, lines 20-25). Carpenter discloses retrieving one or more definitions for dynamically combining available user interface elements in an appropriate manner so as to satisfy current needs, and selecting one of the retrieved definitions based on current conditions so that available user interface elements can be combined in an appropriate manner to generate a user interface that is appropriate to be presented to the user (column 3, lines 55-67).

Referring to claim 63, Carpenter discloses using the selected definition to generate a user interface that is appropriate to be presented to the user and presenting the generated user interface to the user (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 65, Carpenter discloses a method for determining techniques for dynamically generating an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device (column 3, lines 60-67). Carpenter discloses retrieving one or more definitions for dynamically adapting available user interface elements to a type of computing device and selecting one of the retrieved definitions based on current conditions so that available user interface elements can be adapted to the type of the

computing device so as to generate a user interface that is appropriate to be presented

to the user (column 9, lines 1-20).

Referring to claim 66, Carpenter discloses using the selected definition to

generate a user interface that is appropriate to be presented to the user and presenting

the generated user interface to the user (column 3, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 68, Carpenter discloses a method for dynamically determining

an appropriate user interface to be presented to a user of a computing device based on

a current context (column 2, lines 20-25). Carpenter also discloses determining multiple

user interface elements that are available for presentation on the computing device and

characterizing properties of the determined user interface elements, so that available

user interface elements whose characterized properties are appropriate for a current

context can be selected and combined in an appropriate manner to generate a user

interface that is appropriate to be presented to the user (column 8, lines 57-67).

Referring to claim 69, Carpenter discloses combining available user interface

elements whose characterized properties are appropriate for a current context in

order to generate a user interface that is appropriate to be presented to the user and

presenting the generated user interface to the user (column 9, lines 5-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Carpenter and U. S. Patent No. 6, 563, 430 B1 (Kemink et al.), herein referred to as

Kemink.

        Referring to claim 1, Carpenter discloses a computer-implemented method for

dynamically determining an appropriate user interface of a software application to be

presented to a user of a computing device based on a current context (column 2, lines

20-25). Carpenter also discloses for each multiple predefined user interfaces,

automatically characterizing multiple properties of the predefined user interface (column

2, lines 50-55). Carpenter discloses characterizing multiple properties for elements that

are to be displayed for multiple user interfaces that are displayed based on the current

location (column 2, lines 49-55). Carpenter also discloses dynamically determining one

or more current needs for a user interface to be presented to the user (column 2, lines

55-60). Carpenter discloses automatically selecting for presentation to the user one of

the predefined user interfaces who's characterized properties correspond to the

dynamically determined current needs (column 2, lines 49-59). Carpenter discloses

multiple alternative predefined user interfaces of a software application that are

available for performing a common activity (column 2, lines 51-55). Carpenter discloses

multiple properties reflecting the user interfaces configured for use within a particular

environment (column 2, lines 49-55). Carpenter discloses that the current needs used

for determining the user interface to be displayed in a computing device is based on

current conditions at a time of the determining, where the current conditions include the

current location (column 2, lines 49-59). Carpenter does not disclose providing

alternative multiple predefined user interfaces for using with I/O devices, where based on current context and the I/O device displaying the user interface, the predefined user interface is chosen. Kemink discloses determining user interfaces based on the I/O device, which is based on the user interface that is to be presented (column 2, lines 12-18). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Kemink to use I/O devices through which user interaction and display of the user interface occurs for determining the user interface that is displayed. Carpenter discloses that various parameters, in combination with the current context can be used for defining the user interface to be presented, the user interface chosen from multiple alternative predefined user interfaces (column 8, lines 1-4). Kemink provides another such parameter including taking into consideration the devices in which the user is interacting with for determining the types of user interface to display. Therefore, it · would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Kemink to use I/O devices through which user interaction and display of the user interface occurs for determining the user interface that is displayed.

Referring to claim 2, Carpenter discloses presenting the selected predefined user interface to the user (column 3, lines 61-67).

Referring to claim 3, Carpenter discloses that the computing device is a wearable personal computer (column 4, lines 61-67).

Referring to claim 4, Carpenter discloses that the current context is represented by a plurality of context attributes that each model an aspect of the context (column 3, lines 64-67).

Referring to claim 5, Carpenter discloses that the current context is a context of the user (column 5, lines 8-11).

Referring to claim 6, Carpenter discloses that the selecting is performed at execution time (Figure 3).

Referring to claims 7 and 8, Carpenter discloses that the dynamic determining and the selecting are performed repeatedly so that the user interface that is presented to the user is optimal and appropriate to the current needs (column 6, lines 39-46).

Referring to claims 9 and 10, Carpenter discloses that determining of the current needs includes characterizing user interface (UI) needs corresponding to a current task being performed, characterizing UI needs corresponding to a current situation of the user, and characterizing UI needs corresponding to current I/0 devices that are available (column 8, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 11, Carpenter discloses determining of the current needs includes characterizing a current cognitive availability of the user and identifying the current needs based at least in part on the characterized current cognitive availability (column 8, lines 60-67).

Referring to claims 12, Carpenter discloses that the determining and the selecting are performed without user intervention (column 3, lines 51-55).

Referring to claim 13, Carpenter discloses that the selected user interface includes information to be presented to the user and interaction controls that can be manipulated by the user (column 9, lines 6-21).

Referring to claim 14, Carpenter discloses monitoring the user in order to produce information about the current context, or monitoring a surrounding environment of the user in order to produce information or monitoring the user and the surrounding environment of the user in order to produce information about the current context (column 8, lines 57-67).

Referring to claim 15, Carpenter discloses that the determined current needs are based at least in part on the current context (column 8, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 16, Carpenter discloses customizing the selected user interface based on the user before presenting of the customized user interface to the user (column 8, lines 59-63).

Referring to claim 17, Carpenter discloses adapting the selected user interface to a type of the computing device before presenting of the adapted user interface to the user (column 4, lines 20-35).

Referring to claim 18, Carpenter discloses adapting the selected user interface to a current activity of the user before presenting of the adapted user interface to the user (column 8, lines 60-65).

Referring to claim 19, Carpenter discloses that the determining of the current needs is based at least in part on the user being mobile (column 8, lines 60-65).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Carpenter discloses providing multiple groups of elements representing multiple

user interfaces from which a distinct group or user interface is chosen based on the

current location (column 2, lines 53-59). The predefined multiple groups of icons,

include where each group represents a distinct user interface that is appropriate for a

distinct location. The multiple properties include the multiple icons, which are used for

characterizing the user interface, which is representative of various contexts. Although

Carpenter does not provide the I/O device detail configurations as disclosed in claim 1,

Carpenter provides motivation for obviousness to combine, where Carpenter points out

that various other parameters may be taken into consideration for determining what type

of user interface to display to the user, taking into consideration the I/O devices to which

the user interface is applied to. Distinct groups of icons that are used pertaining to a

distinct use interface would represent properties of that user interface, with these being

a characteristic of that user interface.

Claim 40 discloses a process for determining that a specific user interface is

compatible with one or current I/O computing device, where Carpenter discloses

examples shown of determining user interface for one computing device in which the

user interface is displayed, where the parameters of the computing devices are used to

determine what type of user interface to display to the user. See column 4, lines 1-19.

Carpenter discloses an automation process for determining the types of user interface

to display, where although a manual process with user intervention is suggested,

Carpenter further points out that the determination of the user interface can be carried

out automatically (column 5, lines 50-65). Carpenter also further points out that the

determination of the user's current interests or mental state can be carried with user

input or can be carried out automatically, thereby teaching that user intervention is not

required (column 6, lines 29-32). Current tasks include certain tasks that the user is

carrying out which can help determine further user interface to provide to the user

(column 6, lines 10-31). Carpenter determination of historical usage including which

user interface elements were given more attention in the past is used to determine what

to currently display and will be given the attention based on past usage data. Carpenter

further teaches that the selection of the groups of icons representing the user interface

is based on the current location of the user, which represents the current needs of the

user, where the groups of icons selected are selected based on the current needs.

Conclusion

6.   Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The

United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related

correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand

carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in

37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the

Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4054. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file.

PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record

includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published

in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG

89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
November 13, 2006

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173